



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

nent. The poetic significance of Wordsworth escapes him completely (II, 54 f.). A poem of the importance of *Tintern Abbey* is not even mentioned. Nevertheless, it would be captious not to emphasize H.'s remarkable ability to enter into national temperaments differing from his own.

All the more surprising is the unsatisfactoriness of his treatment of German literature. His discussion of the æsthetic value of the *Nibelungenlied* (II, 145 f.) is altogether weak. The treatment of Goethe (II, 201 ff.) would make the sage of Weimar appear as a prolific writer of considerable talent, and nothing more. *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* (II, 209) is passed over with the phrase "der zerfließende Roman" without one further word of comment. It is well-nigh unpardonable in a German treatise to make no attempt at understanding this extraordinary work as the great exponent of the romantic genius and one of the most important prophecies of the art of Maeterlinck. Brentano (II, 211) H. dismisses summarily with the words: "Lesbar ist keines seiner Werke mehr. Es fehlt jede Darstellungskraft, jede künstlerische Zucht." He makes no effort at doing justice to the narrative art displayed in the story *Vom braven Kasperl und dem schönen Annerl*, and does not even mention *Die mehreren Wehmüller* with its mad charm. Furthermore, I cannot feel that H. is fair to so complex and original a thinker as Herder (II, 200 f.). As far as I can judge, H.'s treatment of Italian literature is the most satisfactory, that of German literature the least so.

Perhaps the greatest value to the public in a work of this sort would reside in the wealth of material presented. To find within two covers a history of literatures recondite or little known must, of course, be most welcome. Here H. appears to me to meet every reasonable demand. So, the chapters on Byzantine literature (I, 164 ff.) must be grateful to all those anxious to study the medieval currents of literary life from a larger international point of view, and the "Christliche Literaturkreis" (I, 196 ff.) is valuable for a comprehension of many later literary phenomena. But H. does not stop there. He offers chapters on Rhaeto-Romanic literature (I, 304 f.), on Albanese (I, 307 ff.), on the literatures of the various dialects of India and Persia, of the Mon-

gols, the several Slavic tribes, the Turks, etc., etc. To suggest additions may seem cavil. I may say, however, that I missed in Italian literature a reference to D'Azeglio's "I miei Ricordi" and its importance as a document of the genesis of the "risorgimento." More serious is the complete absence of any systematic treatment of Yiddish literature. A "Weltgeschichte" should certainly take some cognizance of such a rich expression of the life of several million people, especially after Leo Wiener's treatise: *The History of Yiddish Literature in the Nineteenth Century*. New York, Scribner, 1899. Remarks like "Semen Gregorewitsch Frug . . . der auch im Jargon schrieb" (I, 66) can hardly be regarded as sufficient.

In conclusion we may say that this book, the value of which is enhanced by excellent illustrations, will in spite of faults (many of which I appreciate are unavoidable in a work of such compass), be found a useful and reliable compendium of literatures.

CAMILLO VON KLENZE.

Brown University.

Stage Decoration in France in the Middle Ages, by DONALD CLIVE STUART. New York: Columbia University Press, 1910. ix, 230 pp.

This study of the medieval stage of France shows considerable differences of treatment from its predecessors. By considering drama in the Middle Ages as a unit, the evidence of both secular and religious plays has been combined. Where the texts themselves do not furnish any specific directions, their individual lines have been searched for hints regarding their setting. These innovations are important. They alone give the volume unusual worth. And besides, the author follows a direct chronological order in his exposition. The conditions peculiar to the thirteenth century, for instance, are distinguished from the situation which obtains in the fourteenth and fifteenth. The indoor theater of the *pui* or fraternity—the ancestor of the Renaissance stage—is also carefully differentiated from the open-air structures placed in front of churches or built in public squares.

One of the interesting questions which runs through several chapters concerns the position of the different parts of the scenery relative to one another. How many levels were presented to the spectators? Were Heaven and Hell always set above and below Earth? The earliest play which can be cited as a witness is *Adam*, where there were two levels, one for Earth, the other for the Earthly Paradise. But Hell is merely indicated, by doors or gates. Plays contemporaneous with *Adam*, as the fragment of the *Resurrection* and Bodel's *Jeu de St. Nicolas*, and those which came half-a-century later, Rutebeuf's *Miracle de Th  ophile* and Adan de la Hale's comedies, require but one level, Earth. Bodel, to be sure, divides the scenery on that level into four sections, corresponding to a palace, a prison, a tavern and a hut. Now if these survivals of the thirteenth century drama are representative, the conclusion follows that the stage setting of the time was simple, and that it was all in place when the action began.

It is probable that the fourteenth century saw a considerable development of the open-air play. The pantomime of the *Passion* given by Philip le Bel, in 1313, and the pageant in honor of Isabeau of Bavaria, in 1389, would indicate growth in that direction. But the texts of this century, practically limited to the one manuscript of the *Miracles de Notre Dame*, belong to the indoor theater, and do not require any more scenery than Bodel's *Jeu de St. Nicolas*, their elder by at least three generations. From a study of the lines of the *Miracles*—for their manuscript does not offer any guidance as to their staging—Dr. Stuart concludes that the larger number were performed on one level, Earth. In a few Heaven appears on another level, while Hell seems to have been rarely set, if at all. The scenery contained doors and windows. Localities distant from the place of the main action were apparently represented by suggestion only. The stage used by the average *Miracle*, which hardly ever exceeded seven scenes, would not be larger than the one built, near the middle of the sixteenth century, in the Hotel of Burgundy, and if the few settings for Heaven were suppressed it would correspond to that well-known one in kind. Where the *Miracles* ran to eleven or twelve scenes, as they sometimes did, either a wider stage was needed, or the scenery was changed during the performance.

With the fifteenth century, stage decoration reached its height in France. The large open-air plays of that day varied in nature and extent of scenery with the ideas of their constructors. All, however, must have agreed in giving Hell a greater prominence, and it was towards the beginning of the century that Hell's opening as a dragon's mouth was probably invented. As for levels, some plays set Heaven, Earth and Hell on the same plane, and in this order, going from East to West. Others demanded different levels, with Earth midway between Hell and Heaven. Sometimes Hell and Heaven were subdivided even, and five or more stories were used for the action instead of three. The same growth in complexity is also seen in the stage of the fifteenth century *Miracles*, which set Heaven and Hell much more frequently than their predecessors had done.

But it is the stage of the Fraternity of the Passion that is of the greatest consequence for the future history of the French theater. Trinity Hospital and the Hotel of Flanders begot the Hotel of Burgundy. In Trinity Hospital, all localities, Heaven, Earth and Hell, were quite certainly on the same level. Indeed, the stage directions for the plays which were performed there would prove that Heaven and Hell were more often understood than set. The stage sloped towards the front, making the scenery in the rear slightly higher. There were not many scenes in the plays.

The *moralit  s*, farces and *sotties*, secular plays performed indoors, did not require a setting any more extended than the stage of the Fraternity could supply. At least so much might be inferred from the few allusions scattered through their lines. Still, Heaven, when represented in them, occupied a different level from Earth. As for Hell, hardly ever shown, its position remains indefinite. In by far the larger number of these plays Earth alone was used. The average number of scenes was three.

Take *Pathelin* as an example of this kind. It has three scenes: house, shop and court. The house contained a bed for the sick Pathelin. This bed was in full view of the audience, because the front wall of the house was removed. In the side walls would be doors and windows. Accordingly

Pathelin spoke from his bed during the scene of illness, and did not come out to the front of the stage, to an indeterminate place, as Rigal's theory of a conventional speaking-place would imply.

From all of which it would follow that the Parisians, at least, had long been accustomed to a stage of one level and having only a few partitions. To this stage of Trinity Hospital and the Hotel of Flanders Hardy succeeded in the Hotel of Burgundy, and after him Corneille. The average theater-goer of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, attending indoor plays the larger part of the year, would look on the great outdoor mysteries as exceptions, unusual undertakings reserved for festivals and days of public rejoicing. And the tradition of the Franco-Roman stage would consequently be unbroken.

Now, Dr. Stuart would have this tradition reach back into Roman times and find its beginnings in Rome itself. To the formulation of this theory he devotes the pages of his first chapter. And the colporters of the Roman drama down through the centuries to the invention of the liturgical convent plays would be the actors of the Roman school, the mimes. Not only would they have kept the profane theater alive, they would have also suggested to the monks the possibilities of the religious drama by attempts they themselves had made along this line. The hypothesis, as may be seen, is an attractive one. Unfortunately documents seem to be lacking for its proof. Indeed, some allusions may be even cited against its soundness. Dr. Stuart has not found any mention of the mimes' activity during the whole crucial period of the evolution of the liturgical drama, or approximately the tenth century. But at the middle of this period stands one quite explicit witness. Bishop Atto (after 960) of Vercelli, in northwest Italy, not far from French territory, says in one of his sermons on worship, that true worshippers "non laetantur in theatris, ut scenici; non in epithalmiis et cantilenis, ut mimi; non in saltationibus et circo, ut histriones."¹ For "ludus scenicus" is "castitatis raptor," and was invented by Bacchus and Venus. The good bishop surely differentiates actors from the mimes, or singers. And a German contemporary of his

seems to confirm this idea that the mimes were the singers of the crowd, when he speaks of them as singing songs of a great battle.² The same division between actors and singers, but without naming either class, is made by the unknown reviser (1002 or 1003) of the life of Matilda of Germany († 968). After her husband's death "neminem voluit carmina secularia cantantem, nec quemquam videre ludum exercentem," we are told.³ So that the tenth century had its plays equally with the ninth and eleventh. What those plays were and by whom they were acted is not so clear.⁴

F. M. WARREN.

Yale University.

English Dramatic Companies, 1558-1642. JOHN TUCKER MURRAY, M. A. 2 vols. London: Constable and Company, 1910.

Students of the Elizabethan drama have been awaiting for some years the results of Mr. Murray's examination of the records of English provincial towns. It has long been recognized that from these town records we might expect a large addition to our knowledge of the Elizabethan dramatic companies, and also that this additional knowledge is essential to any comprehensive and reliable history of these companies and likely to throw much light on various matters connected with the drama. The results of Mr. Murray's

² Widukind of Corvey (-973-) in Pertz, *Scriptores*, III, 428.

³ Pertz, *o. c.*, IV, 294.

⁴ Dr. Stuart (p. 31) dates *Sponsus* around the year 1000, and is therefore obliged to set the development of the liturgical drama far back into the tenth century, with its origins as early as the ninth and possibly the eighth. But *Sponsus* is a hundred years younger, at least, and therefore, so far as this specimen is concerned, the liturgical drama need not have begun until after the breaking-up of the Carolingian empire and after the invention of its supposed embryos, the tropes of St. Gall and St. Martial's of Limoges. Nor can we gainsay the evidence, whether political, social, religious or intellectual in kind, that only in the closing years of the tenth century was the ground prepared in western Europe for the advent of a new literature, for a new idea of poetry and a new conception of dramatic art.

¹ Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CXXXIV, 844.